



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/073,959	02/14/2002	Hisashi Nakamura	042288	8711
38834	7590	05/04/2005	EXAMINER	
WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP 1250 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW SUITE 700 WASHINGTON, DC 20036			LIU, MING HUN	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2675	

DATE MAILED: 05/04/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

Commissioner for Patents  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS  
AND INTERFERENCES**

Application Number: 10/073,959  
Filing Date: February 14, 2002  
Appellant(s): NAKAMURA ET AL.

**MAILED**

MAY 04 2005

Technology Center 2600

---

Ming-Hun Liu  
For Appellant

**EXAMINER'S ANSWER**

This is in response to the appeal brief filed 12/15/2004.

**(1) *Real Party in Interest***

A statement identifying the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

**(2) *Related Appeals and Interferences***

A statement identifying the related appeals and interferences which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the decision in the pending appeal is contained in the brief.

**(3) *Status of Claims***

The statement of the status of the claims contained in the brief is correct.

**(4) *Status of Amendments After Final***

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

**(5) *Summary of Invention***

The summary of invention contained in the brief is correct.

**(6) *Issues***

The appellant's statement of the issues in the brief is correct.

**(7) *Grouping of Claims***

The rejection of claims 2 and 3 stand or fall together because appellant's brief does not include a statement that this grouping of claims does not stand or fall together and reasons in support thereof. See 37 CFR 1.192(c)(7).

**(8) *Claims Appealed***

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

**(9) Prior Art of Record**

6,322,218	Sugawara et al	11-2001
-----------	----------------	---------

**(10) Grounds of Rejection**

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claims 2 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by US Patent 6,322,218 to Sugawara et al.

In reference to independent claims 2 and 3, Sugawara anticipates the applicant's invention. By referring to figure 3 and column 8, lines 10-20, it can be seen that Sugawara's invention includes the same electrical components as claimed by the applicant. Specially, Sugawara teaches a liquid crystal projector with a cooling fan (items 10 and 12), a temperature sensor for detecting the internal temperature of the liquid crystal projector (item 30), and an air pressure sensor for detecting an outside air pressure (item 56), a driving circuit for the cooling fan (44, 46 and 52; column 7, lines 65-67).

Sugawara also teaches a storage means for storing a control table representing the relationship between the temperature detected by the temperature sensor and the value of a control voltage (figure 8 and column 10, line 55: "a table of a fan applied voltage versus temperature"). Sugawara continues by stating that figure 8 is a graph/table is "at the position where the reference height is an atmosphere pressure" thus anticipating the applicant's limitation of for the driving circuit of the cooling fan for each of a plurality of classes into which the outside air pressure is divided (column 15, lines 22-35)

Sugawara also teaches a means for determining the value of the control voltage (item 52 and 46, column 7, line 66-column 8, line 1) to the driving circuit of the cooling fan. Later on column 15, lines 15-19, Sugawara teaches the incorporation of all three variables in the determination of temperature compensation. "When a relationship of a heat sink of head pipe versus a **temperature** detecting element receives the influence of **air pressure** variations, the temperature compensation can be performed by monitoring the fan rotational frequency, **applied voltage...**" in another words, when the temperature and pressures are changing, the temperature compensation can be performed by monitoring the applied voltage and not just the two variables (temperature and air pressure). Sugawara then continues to teach that temperature compensation TO can be created based on the pressure of various classes of atmospheric pressures (column 15, lines 30-37).

**(11) Response to Argument**

The applicant argues that Sugawara fails to teach a table that represents temperature to control voltage is incorrect as made apparent in figure 8. The applicant's argument that Sugawara fails to include three variables, temperature, control voltage and air pressure is also incorrect because on Sugawara explicitly states that "In figure 8, the lateral axis refers to the fan **applied voltage** and the vertical axis refers to the **temperature** of the liquid crystal light value 4G. Further figure 8, shows that the fan applied voltage at the position where the reference height is an **atmospheric pressure** (760 mm Hg)..." In this case the V vs. T graph was drafted at a particular atmospheric class P at 760 mm Hg.

Art Unit: 2675

And as explained in the rejection of claims 2 and 3, Sugawara does not limit his invention to two variable inputs. It is clear that temperature, air pressure and applied voltages can be used to determine the compensation factor (column 15, lines 15-19). Furthermore, the air pressures can be stratified to different levels according to the positioning of the device (column 15, lines 30-37).

Sugawara also teaches the use of other pressure classes on column 15, lines 30-37.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

Ming-Hun Liu  
April 7, 2005

Conferees  
Sumati Lefkowitz *SL*  
Richard Hjerpe *RHH*

RADER FISHMAN & GRAUER PLLC  
LION BUILDING  
1233 20TH STREET N.W., SUITE 501  
WASHINGTON, DC 20036

  
SUMATI LEFKOWITZ  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER